



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

found in the writings of that greatest of the Fathers, it at once gave the signal for a contest which, for nearly seventy years, agitated the Sorbonne (the College of Divinity in the University of Paris), and the divines of France, in a manner almost unparalleled in the annals of the Gallican Church. Though professedly written to revive the doctrine of Augustine, the "Augustinus" was felt by the society of the Jesuits as in reality an attack upon them under the name of Pelagians. To conscious delinquency the language of implied censure is often more galling than formal impeachment. And the whole efforts of the society were summoned to defeat its influence. On the other hand, St. Cyran, who had aided largely in the composition of this memorable treatise, exerted himself with great effect in building up a society for the maintenance and propagation of the principles it established; and a college of learned men, bound by no monastic vows, and living according to no positive rule, Benedictine, Dominican, or Franciscan, were gradually assembled at Port Royal. Schools for the instruction of youth in every branch of literature and science were kept by Launcelot, Nicole, Fontaine, and De Saci. Some laboured at translations of the Fathers, and other works of piety. Arnauld plied his ceaseless toils in logic, geometry, metaphysics, and theological debate. Le Maitre, and other eminent lawyers, addressed themselves to the work of arbitrating in all the dissensions of the village. From year to year, till death or persecution removed them from the valley of Port Royal, the members of this singular association, though held together by no vows, or governed by no common superior, adhered to their design, and lived together in unbroken harmony; all following their respective callings; silent, grave, abstracted, self-afflicted by fastings, watchings, and humiliations—a body of penitents on their painful progress through a world which they had resolved at once to serve and to avoid. That the immortal Pascal and De Saci (the illustrious author of the best French translation of the Holy Scriptures), were among the number, must for ever shed an undying lustre upon this singular association, even among those the most unfriendly to some of the austerities they practised. They were not, however, long left in peace.

That St. Cyran was a patron of the fraternity, and that Antoine Arnauld, who had so often contended against the casuistry, the theology, and the morals of the Jesuits, was one of its members, was sufficient to draw down upon the whole body the direst enmity of that formidable society. One Brisacier, a Jesuit, led the assault; followed by Father Megnier, who accused the Abbot of St. Cyran and Arnauld of a conspiracy against the religion of Christ, in terms so extravagant that the accusation overstepped the bounds of human credulity and refuted itself. The mode of attack was subsequently changed by Nicolas Cornet, a Jesuit and syndic of the faculty, who was the author of the far-famed "Five Propositions" which he said were deduced from the "Augustinus" of the Bishop of Ypres, by Arnauld, and other doctors of the Gallican Church, and by them inculcated on their disciples. That these five dogmas, lying in the dim regions of psychological divinity, on the mystery of Divine grace, were actually to be found within the "Augustinus" of Jansenius, was not the original charge. The propositions were worded by Cornet with the most artful ambiguity. The phrases were so contrived, as to be capable of two or even three different constructions.* The propositions, thus carefully worded and maliciously constructed, were condemned, first by the Sorbonne, and then by Pope Innocent X. (in a Bull, dated 31st May, 1653), as heretical; and to the authority of the Holy See, Arnauld and his friends, as earnest and submissive sons of the Church, implicitly bowed. The Pope had only as yet pronounced on a matter of faith; and those who had been brought up to admit his infallibility in such matters could not resist the decision, without abandoning the Church to which they were sincerely attached. The Jansenists unanimously signed the paper; each, at the same time, adding to his signature a denial, that the propositions were in the book of Jansenius. The alleged heresies being thus disposed of, one might have supposed the controversy was happily at an end; but, there still remained the question in point of fact. Admitting even that the obnoxious propositions were heretical, were they, in point of fact, really to be found in the "Augustinus" or not? Arnauld ventured to declare that he had studied the book from end to end, and could not find them in it. That there they were, nevertheless, the Jesuits as strongly asserted. To have quoted, by chapter and page, the alleged passages, after the manner, which, in the present day, we deem the only one likely to lead to infallible results, would, however, have spoiled the most promising quarrel which had arisen since the close of the Council of Trent. Still-born must then have perished the ever-memorable distinction of the *droit* and the *fait*, the difference between infallibility in matters of faith, and matters of fact (which has since often perplexed and exasperated the combatants within the pale of the Church of Rome)—the *droit* being, in this instance, the justice of the papal censure of the five propositions, which all Catholics admitted; the *fait* being the existence, in the "Augustinus," of the pro-

positions so-censured, which all Jansenists denied. The vulgar mode of trial by quotation being discarded or refused, nothing remained but trial by authority; and the Pope, instigated by the Jesuits, promulgated a Bull which decreed that the five propositions were in the book; and a conclave of Parisian doctors, selected by Annat, the king's confessor, a Jesuit in religion, and Mazarin, the king's minister, a Jesuit in politics, required that all the ecclesiastics and all the religious communities of France should subscribe their assent to the order which had thus fastened the offensive opinions on the poor Bishop of Ypres. At the bidding of the king, a synod of the clergy of France drew up an anti-Jansenist test or formula, to be taken by all ecclesiastics and all religious communities, male and female, fortified, of course, by effective penalties. They were all required to subscribe their names to a declaration, that the five propositions, in their heretical sense, were to be found in the *Augustinus*; nor was there any exception in favour of those who had never seen the book (which, by the way, is a most ponderous folio of 900 pages), or of those who could not read Latin. This was no ineffectual menace. Blow after blow fell on those who refused, and even on those who were expected to refuse, thus to condemn the long deceased Bishop of Ypres. Port Royal was foremost among such obdurate recusants, and the exquisite wit and matchless satire of Pascal's Provincial Letters has secured an immortal interest to the otherwise contemptible dispute, which has covered with ridicule no inconsiderable part of the Christian world at that period. Even the fame of Pascal, however, did not avail. The schools of Port Royal, male and female, were dispersed. The recluses were banished from the valley. St. Cyran, the leader and ornament of the party, languished, for five years, in the dungeon of Vincennes, and only survived his release by a few months, and the great Arnauld, who had once refused a cardinal's hat, died in 1684, in exile, without one servant to attend him.* The admission of novices and postulants was interdicted to the abbess; and Angelique was now sinking under the pressure of infirmity and old age. In vain she addressed to the Queen Mother a letter, justly celebrated as a model of epistolary eloquence, detailing the wrongs of her sisterhood, and the cause of their persecution. Day after day, these helpless women were torn from the arms of their dying mother. M. Perfixe, the Archbishop of Paris, imprisoned twenty-six of them. He then repaired in pontifical state to the Port Royal monastery, and again tendered the anti-Jansenist test. Angelique was gone (she died on 6th August, 1661, at the age of 70); but her spirit and her constancy survived. The simple-hearted nuns thought it would be a mere falsehood to attest the existence of "five propositions" in a book which they had never seen and could not read; and truth, they knew, was the command of God, let Pope, cardinal, or archbishop say what they would to the contrary. Perfixe interdicted their admission to the holy sacrament. "Well, my lord," they replied, "there is in heaven a judge who reads the heart, and to him we commend our cause." The prelate's reply was almost too shocking to be repeated—"When we get to heaven it will be time enough to consider that, and see how things go there."

For ten months the nuns showed no change of purpose, and remained in prison. He then ordered them to return to Port Royal des Champs, there to be excluded from the sacraments of the Church, and die without her benediction. The invincible opposition of the Port Royalists to the test had, however, awakened a more extended resistance. Men had begun to deny the right of assemblies of the clergy, or of the king himself to impose such subscriptions. Louis, however, could not retract, and desired the Pope himself, first to draw up a formula, which should declare his own infallible knowledge of matters of fact, and then to require the universal acceptance of it. Pope Alexander VII. gladly complied, and fulminated a Bull on the 16th November, 1656. Subscription to the test, or formula, as it was called, was now exacted by Papal authority, with the addition, that the subscribers should call on the Deity himself to attest their sincerity. It was conceived in the following terms:—"I condemn, from my inmost soul, and by word of mouth, the doctrine of the five propositions, which are contained in the work of Cornelius Jansenius. A doctrine which is not that of St. Augustine, whose sentiments Jansenius has misinterpreted." Such was the celebrated formula dictated by the realm, and extorted by the intrigues of the Jesuits. The Jansenists, to a man, refused their signature, and persecution burst forth from every quarter. The great body of the clergy of France submitted; but still the resistance of the nuns of Port Royal was unsubdued. Four years of persecution—of mean, unmanly, worrying persecution—followed. From the poor remnant of earthly comforts which those aged women had retained, the mean-spirited king and his bigotted archbishop daily stole whatever could be so pilfered. From their means of preparing for the world where the wicked cease from troubling, every deduction was made which sacerdotal tyranny could enforce. But no tyranny could induce

them to attest a lie. One after another went down, with no priestly absolution, to graves which no priest would bless; strong, even amidst the weakness and mental agonies of nature, in the assurance that the path to heaven could not be found in disobedience to the immutable laws which heaven itself had established. At last a Papal Bull was obtained for the total suppression of the monastery; and in October, 1709, it was carried into effect by an armed force, under the Marquis D'Argenson.

In a grey autumnal morning a long file of armed horsemen was seen to issue from the woods which overhung the monastery. Seated in the abbatial throne, D'Argenson, in the name of Louis, summoned the nuns to his presence. Their papers, title-deeds, and property were then seized, and proclamation of a royal decree made for their immediate exile. Each pursued her solitary journey to the prison destined for her. Of these venerable women some had passed their eightieth year, and the youngest was far advanced in life. Labouring under paralysis and other infirmities of old age, several of them died under the distress and fatigues of their journey. Last in the number appeared at the gates of the abbey the Prioress Louise de St. Anastasie Mesnail de Courtiaux. To each she had given her parting benediction. She shed no tears, nor for a moment betrayed the dignity of her office or the constancy of her mind. "Be faithful to the end," were the last words she addressed to the last companion of her sorrows; and nobly did she fulfil her own counsels. She was conducted to a convent, where she endured all the rigours of a jail. Deprived of all the religious comforts which it is in the power of man to minister, she enjoyed a solace and found a strength which it was not in the power of man to take away. In common with the greater part of her fellow-sufferers, she died without any priestly absolution, and was consigned to an unhallowed grave. They died the martyrs of sincerity; strong in the faith that a lie must ever be hateful in the sight of God, though infallible Popes should exact it, or an infallible Church, as represented by cardinals and confessors, should persuade it.

The monastery and the adjacent church were overthrown from their foundations. Workmen, prepared by hard drinking for their task, broke open the graves, in which the nuns and recluses of former times had been interred. It is some slight satisfaction to know that some families besought permission to remove the bodies of their relations, and that the bodies of the Arnauld family, of De Tillemont, Racine, Le Maitre, and De Saci, were among the number removed, and who got decent burial elsewhere. No trace was allowed to remain of the fortress of Jansenism to offend the eyes of the Jesuits, or to perpetuate the memory of the illustrious dead, with whom they had so long contended. The mutilated Gothic arch, the water-mill, and the dovecot, rising from the banks of the pool, with the decayed towers and the farm-house, on the slopes of the valley, are all that now attest that it was once the crowded abode of the wise, the learned, and the good. In that spot, however, may still be seen the winding brook, the verdant hills, and the quiet meadows, nature's indestructible monuments to the devout men and holy women who nurtured there affections which made them holy in their lives, and hopes, which rendered them triumphant in death. Nor, in her long roll of martyrs, has history to record the names of any who suffered with greater constancy, or in a nobler cause; for their conflict was with the very Church which they most profoundly revered, and their cause was that of devotedness to sincerity, and abhorrence of falsehood.

HISTORY OF THE POPES.—No. II.

THE POPES OF THE TENTH CENTURY.

WE gave in our last number the history of the madman, Pope Stephen VI., and his predecessor, Pope Formosus. We promised then to proceed with other instances taken from the history of the Popes.

We are unwilling to be suspected of picking instances here and there, however forcible those instances might be. We, therefore, adopt a course above all suspicion; we take up the history exactly where we dropt it—at the death of Pope Stephen VI.; we begin again with his successor, and we propose to continue the history of the Popes for ONE HUNDRED YEARS, giving each Pope in regular succession; and we take the history from no Protestant author, but from the learned Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, in their great work, the "Concilia Generalia"; and we ask Roman Catholics to consider, when they have read it, whether this be the fulfilment of the promises which God has made to his Church?

We must first settle the list of the Popes before we can give their history. We take that list from the greatest modern authority, Bishop Milner, in his "End of Controversy."

Bishop Milner thus gives the reasons for tracing the succession of the Popes:—

"If a prince is desirous of showing his title to a throne, or a nobleman or gentleman his claim to an estate, he fails not to exhibit his genealogical table, and to trace his pedigree up to some personage whose right to it was unquestionable. I shall adopt the same precise method on the present occasion, by sending your society a slight sketch of our apostolical tree; by which they will see, at a glance, an abridgment of the succession of our chief bishops in

* Those who are curious to understand the matter more fully may consult, with profit, the able historical introduction of Dr. Thomas McCrie, prefixed to his translation of "Pascal's Provincial Letters," of which the second edition was published by Johnston, Prince's-street, Edinburgh, in 1848.

* Even at the risk of interrupting our main object, we cannot help recording a memorable saying of this indomitable man. Though driven from France and hunted from place to place, he continued to fight to the last. On one occasion, wishing his friend, Nicole, to assist him in a new work, the latter observed, "We are now old; is it not time to rest?" "Rest," exclaimed Arnauld, "have we not all eternity to rest in?"

the Apostolical See of Rome, from St. Peter up to our present edifying Pontiff, Leo XII.*

In this "precise method," we must observe, that if there come in a dozen or two dozen of persons in the succession, who are acknowledged to have no lawful rights at all, the nobleman or gentleman will have a poor chance of establishing his claim. But let us come to Bishop Milner's "succession."

In the list, in letter xxviii., after Pope Stephen, he gives Pope Romanus, who closes the ninth century, and he then goes on with the tenth century. "The several Popes during this century were"—

Theodore II.	Stephen IX.
John IX.	Martin II.
Benedict IV.	Agapetus II.
Leo V.	John XII.
Christopher	Benedict V.
Sergius III.	John XIII.
Anastasius	Benedict VI.
Lando	Domnus II.
John X.	Benedict VII.
Leo VI.	John XIV.
Stephen VIII.	John XV.
John XI.	Gregory V.
Leo VII.	

We think it a great matter to have the list from a modern authority who is above all exception; and we now proceed to give the history of the Popes in Bishop Milner's list, as we find it in the work of these most learned Jesuits.

POPE ROMANUS.

We begin with Pope Romanus, with whom Bishop Milner closes the ninth century. Here is his history from Labbe and Cossart:—

"Romanus, a Galesian by nation, the son of Constantine, was made Pope in the year of our Lord 900. He sat four months and twenty days. He openly condemned the acts of Stephen made against Formosus, and he crowned as emperor, Ludovic, the son of Bosio, after the flight of Berengarius."* And this is all. Not much (our readers will say) for the life of a Pope; but still, surely, a most legitimate Pope.

Well, now, just look to the list of Popes given by the same Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, in vol. xvi., p. 132, and there we find this same Romanus not given in the list or reckoned in the number of the Popes, but inserted thus, in a note, in italics:—"Romanus Gallesinus per vim intrusus"—Romanus, a Galesian, intruded by force. The Pope before him is number 114 in this list, and the Pope after him 115; yet Bishop Milner reckons him in the succession by which the title is proved.

POPE THEODORE II.

The whole of his history is as follows:—"Theodore, the second of his name, a Roman by nation, the son of Photius, was appointed in the room of Pope Romanus, in the year of our Lord 901, in the time of Ludovic IV., emperor of the west. He sat only twenty days. But on what day he died none of the ancients has disclosed. The opinion of the moderns, derived from conjecture, varies."† In other words, for all we can tell, he was turned out, and another took his place while he was living—a thing that very often happened in that age.

POPE JOHN IX.

His history is chiefly political. Berengarius, Duke of Friuli, took the emperor prisoner, deprived him of his empire, and put out his eyes. Coming to Rome with an army, he demanded the imperial crown from the Pope, which the Pope gave him. After the death of the emperor, the Pope recalled Lambert, whom Formosus had made emperor, and declared the coronation of Berengarius void. "And when very many of the Romans favoured Berengarius, and adhered to him against Lambert, Pope John, not thinking himself safe if he should stay at Rome, went to Ravenna, and there, in a synod, declared void the acts of Stephen against Formosus; and in these most turbulent times, like another Jeremiah sent from God, he pulled up, scattered, and destroyed all those things which had been badly planted, and most wickedly built up by his predecessor, Stephen. He sat three years and fifteen days, and died in the year of our Lord 905."‡

His condemnation of Stephen seems somewhat political; and it seems it was not the first time that a Pope has fled from Rome, when the present Pope did so in 1848, because it was not safe to stay. But it does seem strange that a "successor of Peter," and a "vicar of Christ," should become "another Jeremiah sent from God," § by destroying all that a previous "successor of Peter, and vicar of Christ" had done! But such is the history of the Papacy, as related by the Jesuits themselves.

POPE BENEDICT IV.

We shall give this Pope's life literally, and in full. "Benedict IV., a Roman by nation, after the interval of one day, was appointed in the room of John IX., in the year of Christ 905, in the time of Lambert the emperor. Most munificent to the poor, the widows, and the orphans, he shone like a brilliant star among the Popes of these times. In the third year of his

Pontificate, which is the year of Christ 907, he departed this life, and was buried near St. Peter, by the entrance, by which the way leads to St. Gregory, where also his sepulchre was adorned with an epitaph, which Baronius has, copied from Manlius, in the aforesaid place."*

The Jesuits, as in duty bound, praise where they can; and we, who are not selecting instances, but transcribing history fairly, willingly record their praise.

POPE LEO V.

"Leo V., an Ardeatine by nation, was appointed in the room of Pope Benedict IV., in the year of our Lord 907, in the time of the Emperor Lambert. And when he had governed the Church forty days, being driven from the pontificate, he was thrust into prison by Christopher—an invader of the Apostolical See—in the same year, without doubt, in which he had obtained the Pontifical See."† This is the whole of his history.

POPE CHRISTOPHER.

"Christopher, an invader of the Apostolical See, was ejected from the pontificate by the invader, Sergius, in the same way in which he himself had removed from his See his own predecessor, Leo V., lawfully elected. For when he (Christopher) had held the Pontifical See seven months, being violently ejected from the See by Sergius, and loaded with chains, and cast into prison, being compelled by force, he undertook the life and habit of a monk."‡ This is the whole history of Pope Christopher.

Thus a lawful Pope, Leo V., was thrust out, and an usurper seized the See, while the lawful Pope was living; and yet that usurper is counted in the succession by which Bishop Milner proves the title of the present Pope! But let us go on, for the succession still gets better—or worse, as you may call it.

POPE SERGIUS III.

"Relying on the most powerful arms of Adelbert, Marquis of Tuscany, that cursed Sergius, a man the slave of all vices, and the most wicked of all men"—these are the words of the Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, "who, together with Stephen VI., had raged above measure against Pope Formosus, invaded the See of Christopher, and, therefore, by all, is counted not a legitimate Pontiff, but an invader of the Apostolical See." . . . "Through ambition of the Apostolical See, he betook himself to the Franks, says Sigebertus, and by their assistance, seizing the invader, Christopher, and thrusting him into prison, having privately entered Rome, he invaded the Papacy, and drove the Romans, by threats and terrors, to count all the ordinations of Formosus void; that he also ordained over again all who were ordained by Formosus, and superinduced new ordinations of them, Auxilius testifies."§

But if this man is counted by all to be "NO LAWFUL POPE, but an invader," how comes it that Bishop Milner reckons him in the succession by which the title of the present Pope is proved? Is it no flaw in the succession to have those in it who were not lawful Popes?

That this re-ordination of persons already ordained was sacrilege according to the Church of Rome, we have already shown in our account of Pope Stephen in our last number.

But is there no explanation of all this? Of course there is; the Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, were able to explain it, and we give their explanation. "But, lest any faint-hearted person should take scandal at this deed, let him remember that these things were perpetrated by invaders and intruders, usurping the name of Pope, and unlawfully invading the Apostolical throne, and who, by the censure of the Church, were to be called not so much *Apostles* as *APOSTATES*; but those who were lawfully created Roman Pontiffs, such as John IX., vehemently execrated those things. Whence it is not wonderful that Sergius, with Stephen, the most potent invader of the Apostolical See, should have attempted and usurped things which cannot be granted by the sacred laws. The invader of others is a ROBBER; and who would expect from him all things just and lawful?"||

* Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix. col. 510.

† Pulsus a Pontificatu, detrusus est in carcerem per Christophorum, sedis apostolicæ invasorem, anno eodem haud dubie quo pontificatum adeptus fuit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., col. 515.

‡ Christophorus invasor sedis apostolicæ, pari modo ab invasore Sergio pontificatu delictus, quo ille predecessorem suum Leonem quintum legitime electum sede sua amoverat. Nam cum septem menses sedem pontificalem tenuisset, dejectus est e sede violenter per Sergium, strictisque vinculis, et in carcerem trusus, per vim inductus vitam et habitum monasticum suscepit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., col. 516.

§ Sergius ille nefandus Adelberti Tuscie marchionis armis potentissimus fructus, homo vitiorum omnium servus, omniumque facinorosissimus, qui una cum Stephano Sexto in Formosum papam supra modum avariæ, sedem Christophori invasit, adeoque ab omnibus non legitimum Pontificem, sed invasor sedis apostolicæ est habitus. . . . Ambitione sedis apostolicæ ad Francos se contulit, ait Sigebertus, et eorum auxilio Christophorum invasorem capiens, et in carcerem trudens, latenter Romam ingressus, papatum invasit, et Romanos minis ac terroribus perpulit, ut omnes ordinationes Formosi irritas haberent. Eundem etiam ordinatos a Formoso Papa exordinasse, novasque eorum ordinationes superinduxisse, testatur Auxilius.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., col. 517.

|| Ne quis vero pusillanimitas ex hoc facto scandalum accipiat, meminerit patrata esse hæc ab invasoribus et intrusis, pontificis nomen usurpantibus, et illegitime thronum apostolicum invadentibus, quique censura ecclesiæ non tam apostolici, quam apostatæ erant nominandi; qui autem legitime creati sunt Romani Pontifices, ut Johannes IX., ista vehementer sunt execrati. Unde non est mirandum, quod Sergius cum Stephano sedis apostolicæ invasore potentissimus, ea que sacris legibus inconcessa sunt, tentaverit et usurpaverit. Altenorum invasor, gravior est; at quis ab isto iusta legitimaque omnia requirit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., col. 517.

These men were no Popes, it seems. They were *APOSTATES*, not *Apostles*; yet, Bishop Milner's succession, by which he says the title of modern Popes must be proved, could not be made out without them! The present Pope traces up his succession through *APOSTATES*. Mind that. But "who would expect honest dealing from a robber?" A very fair question, we think; and one which any plain man can answer. But what a defence is this of the papal claims? Can the Church of God be imposed on by one who enters into office as its head, BY ROBBERY? Is this the fulfilment of the promises which God has made to his Church? Does not our Saviour say that his sheep will not follow a robber, but fly from him?—John x. 1, 5, 8. Douay Bible. And was the Church not imposed on? Let us hear what follows:—"And although, what is wonderful, Sergius was such a one, and to cursed sacrilege he added most foul unchastity; and by Marozia, the daughter of that famous harlot Theodora, (of whom we very often speak farther on, from Luitprand in the second book, thirteenth chapter), he begot a son, John by name; yet, ALL THE FAITHFUL, especially the northern people at a distance from Rome, followed the Roman Church with such honour and reverence, that whoever they heard was sitting in it, a Pope only by name, wonderful to be said, without any discussion of how he got in, him they worshipped as Peter!"* And they go on to prove it by several instances! And what conclusion is to be drawn from all this? Hear the conclusion which is drawn by Labbe and Cossart, the Jesuits! "Whence there is no one who does not understand with how great providence the good God rules and governs the universal Church, which, when it is inflamed at the pleasure of harlots, and all evils and scandals increase, and it is to be feared that it will be torn asunder with a great schism, he yet so defends the same from all heresy and schism, that all the faithful of the nations everywhere rather persevere, conjoined in the same bond of faith and league of obedience, and firmly adhere to it."†

The Jesuits think it a wonderful providence that the world did not then turn Protestant—but that the Church continued obedient to the Papacy, when a false Pope, a robber, a sacrilegious debauchee, the most vicious of mankind, had usurped the place of the head of the Church, and vicar of Christ! That the Church should bow down to a robber, and acknowledge him as her head, was a miracle of God's providence, that the Church of Rome only could produce!

But, O God of truth and holiness, is this the performance of thy promise to the Church? Or can any interpretation of thy promises be correct, which rejoices in such a fulfilment as this?

POPE ANASTASIUS III.

This Pope sat two years, and as many months. The only fact that arrests our notice in his brief history is this: "he decorated the Church of Ticina with many, and those, too, magnificent, ornaments; conceding to its bishop the use of the canopy, and to be drawn by a white horse, to have the cross carried before him on a journey, and to sit on the left of the Pope in Councils."‡

And if he never did worse, knowing Popes as we now do, we will not complain of him for having never done better: let him rest in peace.

POPE LANDO.

"Lando, a Sabine by nation, the son of Tranus, succeeded to Pope Anastasius, in the year of Christ 912, in the time of Constantine, Emperor of the East. This Pope, at the pressing entreaty of that most powerful, most noble, and most impudent harlot, Theodora, who had prostituted one of her two daughters, Marozia, to Pope Sergius, and the other, Theodora, to Adelbert, Marquis of Tuscany, and by this means had obtained the dominion of the city (Rome), created John, whom she was most foully in love with, Bishop of Bononia, from being Presbyter of Ravenna; and when Peter, Archbishop of Ravenna, was dead, translated the same to be Archbishop of that same Church of Ravenna. And a little after he had done so foul an act," says Luitprand, Book 2, ch. 13, "he departed this life."§

* Et licet, quod mirandum est, Sergius talis fuerat, et ad sacrilegium nefandum turpissimum impudicitiam addiderit, et ex Marozia, notissimæ illius Scorti Theodoræ, de qua ex Luitprando libro secundo cap. de mortuo infra scriptis, filia, filium Johannem nomine procreaverit; tamen eo honoris et reverentia fideles omnes, præsertim longe positi Boreales populi, prosequantur Romanam Ecclesiam, ut quemcumque in ea sedentem audirent nomine tenus Pontificem, eundem, mirum dictu, nulla habita discussione ejus ingressus, ut Petrum colerent.—Labbe and Coss., vol. x., col. 517.

† Unde nemo non intelligit, quanta providentia ecclesiam universam Deus optimus regat et gubernet, qua cum meretricum arbitrio inflammaretur, omnia mala et scandala inebrescerent, magnoque schismate seindenda metueretur, eandem ab heresi et schismate omni ita defenderit, ut potius omnes ubique gentium fideles eidem filii vinculo et obedientia fœdere juncti persisterent, firmiterque adhererent.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 518. This Pope held the See three years.

‡ Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 567.

§ Lando, patria Sabinus, Trani filius, successit Anastasio Pontifici, anno Christi nongentesimo duodecimo, tempore Constantini octavi Imperatoris Orientalis. Hic ad importunam instantiam potentissimæ, nobilissimæ, et impudentissimæ Scorti Theodoræ, quæ duarum filiarum, alteram Maroziam Sergio Papa, Theodorum vero alteram Adelberti Marchionis Tuscie prostituerat, et per hoc monarchiam urbis tenebat, Joannem, quem illa turpissime deperibat, ex Ravennate Presbytero Episcopum Bononiensem creavit, defunctoque Petro Ravennate Archiepiscopo, eundem in ejusdem Ecclesiæ Ravennatis Archiepiscopum transtulit. Et paulo postquam rem tam fœdam peregerisset, inquit Luitprandus libro 2, cap. 13. ex hac vita migravit.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., col. 568.

* Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., col. 452; Ed. Paris, 1671. As our extracts are so long, we give the Latin only where the matter makes it important or desirable to do so.

† Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., Col. 482.

‡ . . . velut alter Jeremiah a Deo missus, evulsit, dissipavit, et destruxit ea omnia, quæ a predecessore Stephano male plantata atque pessime edificata fuerant.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 483.

§ This expression refers to Jeremiah, i. 10.

There you have the whole history which the Jesuits have to give of Pope Lando! We might comment upon this, but why should we, when we look at what is to follow!

POPE JOHN X.

"John, of whom we have spoken above, in the life of Lando, from being Archbishop of Ravenna was made Pope, or rather FALSE POPE, in the year of our Lord 912, in the time of Constantine, Emperor of the East. The most impudent harlot, Theodora, being vehemently inflamed with the beauty of his appearance, procured him to be appointed in the room of Pope Lando, whom Lando himself had ordained Archbishop of Ravenna from being Bishop of Bononia. Theodora did that, says Luitprand, lest, in consequence of the distance of two hundred miles, by which Ravenna is separated from Rome, she should only very rarely enjoy the concubinage of her lover. Thus an unchaste man, bearing rule by the power of the prostitute of Rome, was made false Pope, and a wicked invader of the See; which, that you may believe that it could have happened, remember reader, that Theodora (as Luitprand testifies) had two daughters—the one Marozia by name, whom she prostituted to the false Pope Sergius; the other Theodora, who, in adultery with Adelbert, Marquis of Tuscany, conceived Alberic, who, at this time, had usurped the principality of the city of Rome, and ruled over it almost alone; besides (remember) that Marozia, after the death of Sergius, had married Wido, Prince of Tuscany, the legitimate son of Adelbert, whose power was so great that he appeared to be called a king rather than a marquis."

Well, this is a reason for having such Popes. These women, in their fornications, and in their marriages, surpassed the common wickedness of mankind. This woman, Theodora, married the son of him by whom her own sister had a son in adultery. And these women, by the political influence which they gained by prostitution and adultery, made the Popes! No wonder that the Popes were the most infamous of mankind!

So the Jesuits go on—"By these waves the ship of Peter was tossed. But Christ sleeping in it, suffered it to be covered and overwhelmed by those storms; but not to be wholly sunk. For being freed from infinite heresies, he rendered it so safe against the most heavy scandals, that FOR THE VERY CAUSE for which the heretical innovators (the Protestants), like impious men, blaspheme the Church, for that very cause the sons of the same Church, in gratitude to God, praise and bless God."

But if any of our readers do bless God for such Popes, elected by such means, we confess we know not what to say to them.

But was this infamous wretch a false Pope or a true one? Bishop Milner considers him essential to the succession; and let us hear the Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart—"From the things transacted under this Pope it is gathered as very probable, that he who had entered as an invader, a thief, and a robber, began to be reckoned as a legitimate Roman Pontiff, by the consent of the clergy accruing to him, when his own troops being joined with Alberic, the son of Adelbert, Marquis of Tuscany, he came to battle with the same against the Saracens. For, after the Saracens were conquered, various embassies are read of, sent to him from different parts of the world for imploring pallis and other things," of which several instances follow. One of them is worth notice—a boy under fifteen years of age was made Archbishop of Rhemes; which (the Jesuits say) Pope John not only did not condemn, but he confirmed the election, which led to a common practice, in after ages, of appointing boys to such offices! And of this the Jesuits very fairly say—"truly a work worthy of such a Pope, whom an infamous woman, by her infamous work, had intruded into the throne of Peter."

The history of Pope John X. thus concludes—"And when after all these things, Pope John had held the See

SIXTEEN YEARS, Wido, Marquis of Tuscany, at the persuasion of Marozia, his wife, who formerly had been prostitute to Pope Sergius, threw into prison him (Pope John) removed from his See, on account of Peter the brother of the Pope, whom they (Wido and Marozia) persecuted with the greatest hatred; and not long after, this invader and unjust possessor of the Apostolic See, died in that same prison, or was most wickedly suffocated by a pillow placed on his mouth, and met with an end worthy of his crimes. So that he who had violently seized the Holy See by means of the unchaste mother, Theodora, being hurled from it and cast into prison by the just judgment of God, was deprived of it, and of his life together, by the equally unchaste daughter."

And this man, John X., was VICAR OF CHRIST, and HEAD OF THE CHURCH, for SIXTEEN YEARS! Or, if he was not, who was? The Jesuits call him a FALSE POPE, and yet say that he came to be taken for a true one! But Bishop Milner reckons him in that succession of Popes, through which the claim of the present Pope must be proved!

The reader is now, perhaps, as much disgusted with the history of Popes as we are. Gladly would we turn from such a subject; but while so many think that the Popes are the inheritors of the promises which Christ has made to his Church, we must needs try and disgust them with that false notion, that they may learn to look for the performance of the promises of Christ to those who have been his true Church in every age—all those who have taught and sought salvation by the name of Christ, and have departed from iniquity. We shall, therefore, continue the history of the Popes of the tenth century in our next number. In the meantime, let our readers consider what Bishop Milner (a Roman Catholic bishop, in England, in the nineteenth century), says of the tenth century:—"This age is generally considered the least enlightened by piety and literature of the whole number. Its greatest disgrace, however, arose from the misconduct of several of the above-mentioned Pontiffs, owing to the prevalence of civil factions at Rome, which obstructed the freedom of canonical election; yet in this list of names there are ten or twelve which do honour to the Papal calendar; and even those who disgraced it by their lives, performed their public duty in preserving THE FAITH and unity of the Church IRREPROACHABLY."

Thus it seems Bishop Milner thought such infamous men were quite capable of being, and actually were very good Popes, and very efficient VICARS OF CHRIST. But, in our opinion, a Christian bishop who, for the sake of bolstering up his cause, can give no harsher name than "misconduct" to such horrible iniquities, does misconduct himself very grossly.

ORIGIN OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

In the approaching month of December, the city of Rome will be the scene of a grave and imposing spectacle. On the 8th of that month, as we learn from various sources, a large number of Roman Catholic bishops and dignitaries, gathered together from all parts of the world, will assemble under the presidency of Pope Pius IX; and it is confidently expected that the result of their deliberations will be, to decide the question of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, which has long been a source of bitter controversy in the Church of Rome, and to make it an article of faith, for all present and future members of that Church.

We have already, on more than one occasion, brought this subject under the notice of our readers,† but we think that it may be useful, at the present crisis, to make a few remarks on the origin of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. In a question which the head of the Roman Catholic Church deems of such pressing importance that he has called to his aid all his best and wisest councillors, to help him to come to a decision, we are sincerely anxious, for our part, that every intelligent member of that Church should be able to form an opinion how far the Pope's decision (whatever it may be) is in conformity with the ancient doctrine of the Christian Church or not.

On the Feast of the Assumption in the present year, a pastoral letter was addressed by the most Rev. Dr. Cullen to the Roman Catholic clergy and laity of Dublin, in which the following passage occurs:—"It is our sad lot to have been born in original sin, and to have inherited from our first parents the maledictions which they brought on themselves by transgressing God's commandments; whilst Mary, by a privilege granted to her alone among all the children of Adam, was conceived free from every stain of sin. Such is the received doctrine of all the Catholic world, and SUCH IT HAS EVER BEEN." It becomes, then, an interesting subject of enquiry, to ascertain the real facts of the case, with

regard to the doctrine in question. If, as Dr. Cullen so positively asserts, the Christian Church has always believed in the Immaculate Conception, it is plain that we ought to find some traces of this doctrine, either in Holy Scripture, or in the works of the ancient Fathers. Dr. Cullen, perhaps through inadvertence, forgot to add any proofs of his assertion; we will endeavour to supply the deficiency, so far as it may be in our power.

When a sect of heretics called the Collyridians, who lived in the fourth century, began to worship the Virgin Mary as a goddess, and to offer up to her little cakes in sacrifice upon her festival, their superstitious practices were at once condemned by Epiphanius Bishop of Salamis; and one of the chief arguments which he employed against these corrupters of primitive truth was as follows:—"What Scripture hath told us any thing concerning this?" In like manner, when a sincere and pious Christian desires to satisfy his mind respecting the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, the first question to which he would naturally desire an answer is this, "what Scripture hath told us anything concerning this doctrine?"

Let us suppose our enquirer to turn for information to Cardinal Bellarmine, the great storehouse of dogmatic theology, and what is the result of his enquiry? Not one single text of Scripture can be adduced in support of the doctrine in question. Nay, more, the learned Cardinal seems almost inclined to be cross and peevish, as if the request for Scriptural authority, or even Church authority, on this point, was quite unreasonable. "People must not expect," saith he, "that we can bring forward an express text of Scripture in this matter, or any certain definition of the Church."† But why must we not expect a plain text of Scripture on this point? The Apostles, it is evident, either believed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, or they did not. If they did believe it, why may we not look for some declaration of their belief, in those holy Scriptures which contain the record of the doctrines they taught? If they did not believe it, what becomes of Dr. Cullen's assertion, that the Church has always held this doctrine?

But we are not left to mere conjecture on this subject, and it was not without good grounds that Bellarmine felt a strong dislike to appeal to Scripture, upon the question of the Immaculate Conception. The Bible has repeatedly described the corruption of the whole human race in such plain and general terms that it is inconceivable, if the Virgin Mary had been really free from sin, that her case would not have been specially excepted by some one or other of the inspired writers. But of such an exception no trace whatever is to be found in the whole of the New Testament. What emphatic language, for example, does St. Paul make use of in his Epistle to the Church of Rome, of his day, as if he almost foresaw the rise of grievous errors upon this very point—"All have sinned, and do need the glory of God."—Rom. iii. 23. "As by one man sin entered into this world and, by sin, death, and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned."—Rom. v. 12. "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin."—Galat. iii. 22. And, if the meaning of these texts be not sufficiently clear, let us listen to the direct and special application which St. Augustine makes of them to the Virgin Mary. "Mary, sprung from Adam, died, because of sin; Adam died because of sin; and the flesh of our Lord, derived from Mary, died to take away sin."‡ Death, we are told in Scripture, is the penalty of sin; and if we believe, as St. Augustine teaches, and as the Christian Church always held, that the Virgin Mary was subject to death, it is plain that, in some shape or other, she must have sinned; and, therefore, her nature could not have been wholly pure.

We cannot place the Scriptural evidence on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in a clearer light than by quoting the words of Melchior Canus, a distinguished canonist of the Church of Rome—"The dogma which holds that the Blessed Virgin was free from original sin is nowhere delivered in the Scriptures, according to their proper sense: nay, the general law which is delivered in them embraces all who were descended from Adam, without any exception. Nor can it be said that this doctrine has descended in the Church by apostolic tradition; for traditions of this kind cannot have come to us through any other persons than by the ancient bishops, and the holy authors who succeeded the apostles. But it is evident that these ancient writers did not receive this doctrine from their predecessors.§

* ποία δὲ τις γραφὴ διηγῆται περὶ τοῦτου—Epiphanius, adv. Hæreses, lib. iii., Hæc. 79. p. 1062. Colon., 1682.

† Neque vero expectandum est, ut expressum Dei verbum adferamus, aut certam aliquam Ecclesiæ definitionem.—Bellarmine, de amiss. Grat. at Stat. Pecc. lib. iv., cap. xv., tom. iv. p. 103. Colon., 1615.

‡ Maria ex Adam mortua propter peccatum; Adam mortuus propter peccatum; et caro Domini ex Maria mortua est propter delenda peccata.—S. August. Op. Enarr. in Psalm xxxiv., Sermon, ix., tom. iv., col. 240. Par., 1691.

§ Beatus Virgineum a peccato originali fuisse penitus liberam e libris sacris juxta germanum litterarum nusquam habetur. Quinimo lex generalis in eis traditur, quæ universos filios Adam, carnali scilicet propagatione creatos, sine ullâ exceptione comprehendit. Nec verò dici potest, per traditionem apostolorum id in ecclesiâ descendisse; cum hujusmodi traditiones non per alios, quam per episcopos illos antiquos et sanctos auctores apostoli succedentes, ad nos usque pervenerint. At constat, priores illos Scriptores non id a majoribus accepisse.—Melchior Canus, De Locis Theol., lib. vii., cap. iii., vol. I., p. 377. Matriti, 1792.

* Johannes, de quo supra in Landone, ex archiepiscopo Ravennate factus est Pontifex, vel potius pseudo-papa, Anno Domini nongentesimo duodecimo, tempore Constantini imperatoris Orientalis. Theodora meretrix impudentissima in hujus speciei decorem vehementer exardens, Landoni Pontifici subrogari procuravit eundem, quem ipse Lando ex Bononiensi episcopo Archiepiscopum Ravennatensem ordinaverat. Fecebat illud Theodora, inquit Luitprandus, ne amassii ducentorum miliarium interpositione, quibus Ravenna sequestratur a Roma, rarissimo concubitu potiretur. Ita impudicus homo meretricis viribus Romæ pollens, factus est pseudo-papa et nefarius sedis invasor. Quod ut fieri potuisset credas, memineris lector, Theodoram, ut testatur Luitprandus, duas habuisse filias, unam Maroziam nomine, quam Sergio pseudo-pontifici prostituit; alteram Theodoram quam per adulterium ex Adelberto Tuscia marchione suscepit Albericum, qui hoc tempore urbis Romæ principatum usurpabat, eique fere solus dominabatur; præterea Maroziam post obitum Sergii nupsisse Wido filii Adelberti legitimo Tusciae principi, cujus tanta erat potentia, ut rex potius quam marchio videretur appellandus.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 569.

† His fluctibus agitabatur navicula Petri. Verum Christus in ea dormiens patiebatur illam ipsis procellis operiri et immergi; sed non plane absorberi. Nam liberatam ab infinitis hæresibus contra gravissimam scandalâ reddidit; adeo tantum, ut qua uis causæ hereticis notatores ecclesiâ, veluti impii, blasphemant, eandem ob causam filii ejusdem ecclesiæ Deo grati Deum laudent, et benedicant.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 569.

‡ The seeking for pallis from a Pope was the strongest recognition which archbishops could give, that they acknowledged that Pope as legitimate, and that they were subject to him as Pope.

§ Ex rebus sub hoc pontifici gestis, verisimile esse colligitur, quod qui invasor, fur, et luto ingressus erat, accidenti elsi consensu, legitimum Romanum Pontificem haberi cepit, quando copis suis cum Alberico filio Adelberti marchionis Tusciae conjunctis, cum eodem contra Saracenos in prælium venit. Nam post Saracenos debellatos, diversæ legationes ex diversis orbis partibus pro pallis aliavie rebus implorandis ad eum missæ leguntur.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 570.

¶ Opus sane tali Pontifice dignum, quem infamia femina infami opere in solam Petri intruserat (p. 370).

* Cumque post hæc omnia Joannes papa annos sedecem sedem tenuisset, Wido Tusciae Marchio, suam Maroziam conjugit, quæ quondam Sergio papa prostituta fuerat, eundem propter Petrum papæ germanum, quem suam invidia prosequeretur, sedis amotum in carcerem conjecit; atque in eodem non multo post defunctus, vel cervicali ori ejus impositis pessime suffocatus finem accepit invasor atque injustus detentor sedis apostolicæ; ut qui per impudicam matrem Theodoram, sacrosanctam sedem violenter arripuit, per filiam æque impudicam, justæ Dei vindictæ, ejectionis, et in carcerem conjactus, ea simul cum vita caruerit.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ix., col. 571.

† Vide CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., p. 19 (February, 1852); vol. iii., p. 97 (August, 1854).